# THE RESEARCHER'S DECLARATION

A Transparent Account of Independent Spiritual Research:
*Methodology, Mind, and the Right to Know*

*"The kingdom of God is within you."*
*— Luke 17:21*

*"You have no need that anyone teach you."*
*— 1 John 2:27*

Research Ethics | Source Hierarchy | ADHD Cognition
Spiritual Authority | Apocryphal Evidence | Verification System

Independent Researcher · Alvarez Consulting · Los Angeles, CA
2026

FOREWORD

# Why This Manual Exists

There is a particular kind of person the established religious world does not know what to do with. Someone who was raised inside a high-control institution, absorbed its texts with ferocious sincerity, found irreconcilable contradictions — and then refused to trade one set of handed-down answers for another. Someone who instead went looking for themselves, with primary sources, scholarly tools, and an appetite for complexity that never quite found a ceiling.

That is who Anthony Alvarez is. And this manual exists because transparency demands it.

Independent research — especially in the fields of comparative religion, esoteric philosophy, and consciousness studies — is regularly dismissed as amateur, biased, or dangerous. Those criticisms often come from institutions that have their own profound conflicts of interest in who is and is not permitted to interpret sacred knowledge. This document does not ask for permission. It demonstrates method.

The pages that follow lay out the actual process: how sources are gathered, weighed, and cross-checked; how the researcher's ADHD-structured mind operates and why that architecture is an asset rather than a liability; what texts and traditions authorize independent spiritual knowledge-seeking; and what intellectual and ethical standards govern every publication produced under the Perennial Truth Library and Alvarez Consulting's Theological & Esoteric Research Division.

Read this as an invitation into a methodology — rigorous, honest, and unafraid.

SECTION 1

# The Philosophical Foundation: The Right to Know

## 1.1 The Authority Problem in Religion

Every major institutional religion has, at some point in its history, declared itself the exclusive gatekeeper of sacred truth. The Catholic Church burned books and their authors. The Jehovah's Witnesses disfellowship members for reading outside approved literature. Sunni orthodoxy declared the gates of ijtihad — independent reasoning — closed in the 10th century. Brahminic Hinduism restricted Vedic knowledge to a single caste for over a millennium.

The pattern is consistent: institutional authority requires a monopoly on interpretation. The individual who arrives at their own conclusions — especially conclusions that diverge from official doctrine — poses an existential threat to that monopoly. This is not speculation; it is documented institutional history available in any accredited library.

This research methodology proceeds from a different premise: that access to divine truth is not issued by a committee. It is the birthright of any mind willing to approach it with sincerity and intellectual honesty.

> *"The kingdom of God is within you. — Luke 17:21 (Jesus of Nazareth)"*

## 1.2 Canonical Texts That Authorize Independent Knowing

The argument for individual spiritual authority is not invented — it is found in the very texts institutions claim to guard. The following passages are among the most direct:

| Source | Text | Implication |
|---|---|---|
| 1 John 2:27 | "The anointing you received from him remains in you, and you do not need anyone to teach you." | The indwelling Spirit is a sufficient teacher — no human intermediary required. |
| John 14:17 | "The Spirit of truth...you know him, because he remains with you and will be in you." | Divine truth resides inside the believer, not in an institution. |
| Luke 17:21 | "The kingdom of God is within you." | The locus of the sacred is internal, not external or hierarchical. |
| Matthew 23:8–10 | "Do not be called 'Rabbi'...Do not call anyone your father...Do not be called leaders." | Jesus explicitly warned against deference to human spiritual authority. |
| John 16:13 | "When he, the Spirit of truth, comes, he will guide you into all truth." | Truth-guidance is promised to the individual via the Spirit — not to an organization. |
| Galatians 1:11–12 | "I did not receive it from any man, nor was I taught it; rather I received it by revelation." | Paul's own apostleship was self-verified through direct revelation, not institutional ordination. |

## 1.3 The Apocryphal Witness

The canonical Bible was itself a product of institutional selection. The Council of Nicaea (325 CE), the Synod of Hippo (393 CE), and the Council of Carthage (397 CE) determined which texts would be included. Dozens of early Christian, Jewish, and Gnostic writings were left out — not because they were false, but because they were inconvenient for the emerging power structure of the institutional church.

Many of these excluded texts reinforce the case for individual spiritual authority more forcefully than the accepted canon:

- **Gospel of Thomas (Saying 3):** "The Kingdom is inside you and outside you. When you know yourselves, then you will be known." — Knowledge of the self is the gateway to divine knowledge.
- **Gospel of Thomas (Saying 5):** "Know what is in front of your face, and what is hidden from you will be disclosed to you." — Truth is available to the attentive observer.
- **Gospel of Philip:** "Those who say they will first die and then rise are mistaken... one who has not received the resurrection will die." — Resurrection is a present interior state, not a future institutional promise.
- **Gospel of Mary Magdalene:** Mary reports receiving direct teaching from the risen Christ — bypassing every male apostle — affirming that spiritual authority is not gender- or hierarchy-bound.
- **Apocryphon of John:** Presents a Gnostic cosmology in which the Demiurge (false creator god) actively suppresses human knowledge of true divine origin. Institutional religion as the Demiurge is a direct reading of this text.
- **The Thunder, Perfect Mind:** A divine feminine voice speaks truth that cannot be contained by any singular tradition: 'I am the first and the last. I am the honored one and the scorned one.'
- **Book of Enoch (1 Enoch):** Quoted directly in the canonical New Testament (Jude 1:14) yet excluded from the Bible. Enoch receives direct angelic transmission of cosmic knowledge — a model of non-institutional revelation.
- **Pistis Sophia:** Sophia (Wisdom) falls, learns, and rises through her own process of discernment — modeling the spiritual journey as personal, interior, and transformative.

## 1.4 The Perennial Philosophy Consensus

Beyond Christianity, every major mystical tradition arrives at a nearly identical conclusion: divine reality is directly accessible to the sincere seeker, and institutional mediation is at best unnecessary and at worst an obstacle. This convergence — called the Perennial Philosophy by Leibniz, Aldous Huxley, and Huston Smith — is one of the strongest arguments in comparative religion:

| Tradition | Teaching on Direct Access |
|---|---|
| Sufism (Islam) | Fanaa — the dissolution of the ego-self into divine union. Al-Hallaj: "I am the Truth (Ana'l-Haqq)." |
| Kabbalah (Judaism) | The Ein Sof is accessible through inner contemplation via the Sefirot. No rabbi stands between the soul and the Infinite. |
| Advaita Vedanta (Hinduism) | Tat tvam asi — Thou art That. The Atman IS Brahman. No external initiation required for one who sees. |
| Zen (Buddhism) | Direct mind-to-mind transmission beyond scripture. "If you meet the Buddha on the road, kill him." |
| Hermeticism | "As above, so below." The cosmos mirrors the self. Gnosis is earned through inner alignment, not institutional membership. |
| Christian Mysticism | Meister Eckhart: "The eye through which I see God is the same eye through which God sees me." |

The Perennial Philosophy is not a single religion. It is the empirical finding of cross-cultural mystical inquiry: that the same direct encounter with ultimate reality has been reported by human beings in every culture across recorded history, independent of any institutional framework.

SECTION 2

# The Research Process: How the Work Actually Gets Done

## 2.1 Overview of the Research Architecture

Independent research in comparative religion and esoteric studies is not casual reading. The Alvarez Consulting research process involves a structured cycle that moves from broad inquiry to verified synthesis. No single source is treated as definitive. Every claim is pressure-tested against multiple traditions, translations, scholarly positions, and — where relevant — the researcher's own experiential data.

### Phase 1 — Inquiry Formation

The research begins with a genuine question, not a predetermined answer. Questions arise from gaps in existing literature, contradictions within canonical texts, cross-traditional parallels, or the researcher's own spiritual experiences demanding theoretical framework.

### Phase 2 — Source Immersion

Primary sources are read first — original scriptural texts (in translation where necessary), Gnostic codices, Hermetic works, Sufi poetry, Vedantic sutras, Kabbalistic texts. The researcher reads widely before forming conclusions.

### Phase 3 — Scholarly Layer

Academic commentary, peer-reviewed biblical criticism, Egyptological research, comparative religion scholarship, and Jungian/depth psychology analysis are layered over the primary sources. This is where hypotheses are tested against expert critique.

### Phase 4 — Cross-Traditional Triangulation

Any claim that survives in only one tradition is treated with caution. Claims that appear independently across multiple traditions — in cultures that had no historical contact — are given significantly more weight. This is the Perennial Philosophy test.

### Phase 5 — Synthesis and Formulation

The findings are synthesized into the researcher's own intellectual framework, clearly distinguishing what is textually established, what is scholarly consensus, what is minority scholarly position, and what is interpretive synthesis.

### Phase 6 — Transparent Documentation

Every major claim in a published document is sourced. Interpretive leaps are labeled as such. The goal is not to appear authoritative but to be verifiable — so that the reader can trace every thread independently.

## 2.2 Source Hierarchy and Trust Calibration

Not all sources are equal. The following hierarchy governs how evidence is weighted in every Perennial Truth Library publication:

| Tier | Source Type | Trust Weight | How Used |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Original-language primary texts (Hebrew, Greek, Aramaic, Sanskrit, Coptic) | Highest | Directly cited via verified scholarly translation; word-study analysis conducted |
| 2 | Peer-reviewed academic scholarship (Elaine Pagels, Bart Ehrman, Karen Armstrong, Huston Smith, etc.) | High | Used to test and challenge initial interpretations; majority and minority views both noted |
| 3 | Established translated collections (Nag Hammadi Library, Dead Sea Scrolls, Pseudepigrapha) | High | Primary source reading; scholarly introduction context considered |
| 4 | Reputable secondary synthesis (Joseph Campbell, Ken Wilber, Aldous Huxley, Carl Jung) | Medium-High | Frameworks and pattern-mapping; not used as doctrinal authority |
| 5 | Cross-traditional wisdom literature (Rumi, Meister Eckhart, Ramana Maharshi, Lao Tzu) | Medium-High | Experiential and poetic corroboration of theoretical frameworks |
| 6 | Institutional religious commentary (denominational publications, church fathers) | Medium | Read critically as institutional perspective; useful for understanding dominant interpretation history |

| Tier | Source Type | Trust Weight | How Used |
|---|---|---|---|
| 7 | Popular spiritual/metaphysical literature | Low-Medium | Consulted for cultural context; never used as standalone authority |

## 2.3 What Constitutes Evidence

A persistent criticism of independent spiritual research is that it is not "scientific." This criticism misunderstands both the domain and the methodology. The Alvarez Consulting research framework distinguishes four categories of evidence, each evaluated differently:

- **Textual Evidence:** What does the text literally say? What is the scholarly consensus on translation? Where do translations diverge, and why? This is the hardest, most falsifiable category.
- **Historical Evidence:** What do archaeology, historical records, and independent ancient sources confirm? For example: the historicity of the Council of Nicaea is documented fact; its specific theological decisions are historically recoverable.
- **Cross-Traditional Pattern Evidence:** When the same concept appears in Vedantic, Sufi, Kabbalistic, and Gnostic sources — developed independently — the probability of mere coincidence decreases. This is comparative religion's equivalent of convergent evidence.
- **Experiential Evidence:** The researcher's own spiritual experiences — including a documented spontaneous Kundalini awakening — are treated as primary data, not as proof of any doctrine, but as first-person phenomena requiring theoretical explanation. They do not override textual or historical evidence, but they are not dismissed.

**ON PROBABILITY CLAIMS**

Earlier versions of some Perennial Truth Library documents included numerical probability estimates for spiritual or metaphysical claims (e.g., '87% probability that X'). These figures have been flagged for removal or replacement in all ongoing revisions. Spiritual and metaphysical propositions are not falsifiable in the empirical-scientific sense, and presenting invented probability percentages as if they were empirically derived is intellectually dishonest — regardless of how confident the researcher is in the underlying argument. Confidence should be expressed in qualitative language: 'strongly corroborated,' 'plausible but disputed,' 'speculative synthesis.'

## 2.4 The Role of Intellectual Honesty

Independent research carries a particular obligation to honesty, because there is no peer review board, no editor, no institutional accountability structure. The researcher is the only check on the researcher. This is both the freedom and the responsibility.

The Alvarez Consulting standards for intellectual honesty are non-negotiable:

- Claims are distinguished from interpretations, and interpretations from speculation. Each is labeled as such.
- Scholarly disagreement is reported when it exists. The research does not hide the existence of counter-arguments.
- The researcher's personal experiences and beliefs are disclosed rather than smuggled into the analysis as neutral facts.
- Sources that challenge the researcher's conclusions are engaged directly, not ignored.
- When a prior claim turns out to be wrong or overstated, it is corrected in subsequent publications.
- No claim is made more certain than the evidence warrants.

SECTION 3

# The ADHD Mind as Research Architecture

## 3.1 A Different Operating System

Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder is typically framed in terms of deficits — what the ADHD brain struggles to do. The neurological reality is more interesting: ADHD is a fundamentally different mode of cognitive processing, one with distinct liabilities in conventional environments and distinct advantages in tasks that require hyperfocused synthesis, divergent thinking, and the ability to hold multiple complex frameworks simultaneously.

Anthony Alvarez's ADHD is not incidental to his research methodology. It is structural to it. Understanding how this mind operates is essential to understanding how this research is produced.

## 3.2 Hyperfocus: The Engine of Deep Research

The ADHD brain's most significant research asset is hyperfocus — the capacity, when engaged with genuinely interesting material, to sustain extraordinary levels of concentration for extended periods. This is not willpower. It is a neurological state in which the default-mode network quiets and task-related networks activate with unusual intensity.

In practice, this means the research often proceeds in long, immersive sessions where entire books are consumed, cross-referenced, and synthesized in a single sitting. The conventional difficulty of sustaining attention — the liability in ADHD — inverts when the material reaches the threshold of genuine interest. At that point, the difficulty is stopping, not starting.

**WHAT HYPERFOCUS LOOKS LIKE IN PRACTICE**

A research session might begin with a single question about a mistranslated Greek word in the Gospel of John. Three hours later, the researcher has traced the word through the Septuagint, compared it to its Aramaic equivalent, found it appearing in the Dead Sea Scrolls, located its use in Philo of Alexandria's Logos theology, and connected that to the Prologue of John in a way that reframes the entire Gospel's opening. This chain-of-association deep-dive is not distraction — it is the research.

## 3.3 Pattern Recognition Across Domains

ADHD cognition is characterized by a tendency to process information associatively rather than linearly. Where a neurotypical researcher might go deep in a single tradition, the ADHD mind constantly pings across traditions, detecting structural similarities that a more linear approach might miss.

This is exactly what comparative religion requires. The Perennial Philosophy's core thesis — that the same mystical truth appears across traditions — is most visible to a mind wired to notice cross-domain patterns. The researcher who notices that the Sufi concept of fanaa, the Hindu concept of moksha, the Buddhist concept of nirvana, and the Christian mystical concept of kenosis all describe structurally similar interior events is doing something a specialist in any one tradition might miss precisely because of their specialization.

## 3.4 Executive Function and Research Structure

ADHD's primary liability is in executive function: the brain systems responsible for initiating tasks, managing time, maintaining working memory across sessions, and sustaining effort on low-stimulation activities. This is a real constraint that is managed, not eliminated.

The structural adaptations employed in this research practice include:

- **External Structure:** Research questions are documented in writing before sessions begin, so the working memory doesn't have to hold the frame. Outlines are built before prose.
- **Momentum-Based Sequencing:** Research is sequenced to follow genuine interest, which sustains engagement. Forcing interest never works; following it always does.
- **Synthesis as Output Discipline:** The act of writing a Perennial Truth Library document is itself a cognitive tool. Turning research notes into publishable prose forces the kind of coherent organization that ADHD cognition resists in the abstract.
- **Single-Task Deep Focus:** One document, one question, one tradition at a time. Multitasking is an ADHD myth — the productive alternative is sequential deep focus.
- **Transparency About Limits:** When a source is not available, it is noted as such. When a research gap exists, it is flagged. The published work does not pretend to more completeness than it has.

## 3.5 Big-Picture Thinking as Structural Strength

One of the most consistent features of ADHD cognition — and one of the most undervalued in conventional academic settings — is the orientation toward big-picture synthesis rather than narrow specialization. The ADHD mind wants to know how everything connects. It is not satisfied with mastering a single node; it wants the entire network.

This is exactly the right cognitive orientation for the research mission of the Perennial Truth Library: to demonstrate that the deepest insights of human spiritual inquiry across all traditions point toward the same territory. That argument cannot be made from inside any single tradition. It requires the capacity to zoom out to the highest level of abstraction and then back down to the specific textual evidence. Big-picture ADHD thinking is the tool for that.

> *"The mind that sees connections others miss is not distracted. It is differently focused."*

## 3.6 The Kundalini Awakening as Experiential Data

On Nisan 14 — the Hebrew calendar date of Passover — the researcher experienced a spontaneous Kundalini awakening: an unsought, dramatic shift in consciousness involving energy ascending the spine, dissolution of ordinary ego-boundaries, perceptions of light and heat, and a profound sense of recognition rather than novelty — as if something long present had finally become visible.

This experience is documented rather than hidden because it is relevant to the research. Every tradition covered in the Perennial Truth Library has a name for this class of experience: the Hindus call it Kundalini; the Sufis call it Kashf; the Kabbalists call it Hitbonenut; the Christian mystics call it the Unitive Experience or Illumination; the Buddhists describe it in the stages of jhana and kensho. The convergence of experiential reports across traditions is itself a data point — and the researcher now has first-person access to that data.

The awakening does not grant infallibility. It grants a motivational and perspectival context that is disclosed rather than concealed. It is why the research has urgency, not why the research is correct. The texts either support a position or they do not.

SECTION 4

# The Perennial Truth Library: Structure and Standards

## 4.1 What the Library Is

The Perennial Truth Library is a curated collection of original research publications produced by the Theological & Esoteric Research Division of Alvarez Consulting. It is organized into eight thematically structured folders covering: foundational perennial philosophy, biblical criticism and translation analysis, esoteric and Gnostic traditions, consciousness and mystical experience, sacred symbolism and numerology, post-institutional spiritual guidance, institutional suppression of mysticism, and Sufi/Islamic mystical traditions.

It is designed for the person who has left or is questioning an institutional religious framework and wants to engage with the depth of human spiritual inquiry from a position of intellectual freedom. It does not tell the reader what to believe. It gives the reader what the researcher found when they went looking.

## 4.2 Publication Standards

**1.** Every publication identifies its primary sources.

**2.** Interpretive claims are distinguished from established scholarly consensus.

**3.** The researcher's personal perspective is disclosed where it shapes the analysis.

**4.** Numerical probability estimates are not used for metaphysical claims.

**5.** Documents are revised when errors are identified — version history is maintained.

**6.** Cross-references between Library documents are maintained for intellectual coherence.

**7.** The target reader is a thoughtful adult capable of evaluating evidence independently.

**8.** No publication argues that the reader must accept its conclusions — only that the evidence is worth considering.

## 4.3 What This Library Is Not

For the sake of full transparency, the following distinctions are stated clearly:

- The Perennial Truth Library is **not** a peer-reviewed academic journal. It is independent research.
- The researcher is **not** a credentialed academic theologian. The research is self-directed and self-funded.
- The Library is **not** claiming to be the only valid interpretation of any text or tradition.
- The Library is **not** anti-religion in general — it is anti-institutional-monopoly specifically.
- The researcher's spiritual experiences are **not** presented as proof of doctrinal positions.
- The Library **does not** claim final answers on metaphysical questions that remain genuinely open.

SECTION 5

# Making the Truth Your Own: A Direct Response to Institutional Religion

## 5.1 A Personal History

Anthony Alvarez was raised as a Jehovah's Witness — one of the world's most thoroughly constructed high-control religious environments. The organization's literature is comprehensive, internally consistent, emotionally compelling, and designed to be the exclusive interpretive lens through which members read scripture. Members are explicitly discouraged from consulting outside sources. The organization's governing body is presented as the exclusive channel of divine communication.

This background is relevant for two reasons. First, it means the researcher has intimate first-hand knowledge of how institutional religious control operates — the specific mechanisms of information restriction, social pressure, and doctrinal enforcement. Second, it means the research began not as an intellectual exercise but as a survival necessity: what does a person do when the entire edifice of their religious world turns out to rest on demonstrably false foundations?

The answer, for Anthony Alvarez, was to go back to the texts — all of them. Not just the canonical Bible, but everything that was excluded, suppressed, or labeled heretical. Not just the Watchtower's interpretations, but the full landscape of biblical scholarship. Not just Christianity, but every tradition that claimed to map the same inner territory.

## 5.2 The Specific Claim of This Research

This research makes a specific, documentable claim: that the gatekeeping function of institutional religion — the insistence that divine truth cannot be accessed without institutional mediation — is not supported by the texts those institutions claim to guard. In fact, many of those texts explicitly argue the opposite.

This is not a spiritual feeling. It is a textual and historical argument. The evidence includes:

- The canonical New Testament explicitly stating that believers have the Spirit of truth dwelling within them and do not require human teachers (1 John 2:27, John 14:17).

- Jesus himself warning against deference to human spiritual authorities under titles like Rabbi, Father, or Leader (Matthew 23:8–10).
- Paul's explicit claim that his apostleship was not derived from any human institution but from direct revelation (Galatians 1:11–12).
- The early Christian Gnostic texts — suppressed by the institutional church — almost universally teaching direct access to divine knowledge.
- The independent testimony of every major mystical tradition across human history that the divine is directly accessible to the sincere seeker.
- The documented historical process by which institutional churches selected, modified, and suppressed texts specifically to consolidate authority.

> *"The truth was never the organization's to withhold. It was always already in the texts — and in the person reading them."*

## 5.3 What Making the Truth Your Own Actually Requires

"Making the truth your own" — a phrase the Jehovah's Witnesses use to mean internalizing the organization's teachings — is reclaimed here in its literal and liberating sense: to arrive, through your own sincere investigation, at conclusions you can personally stand behind. This is not intellectual anarchy. It is the most demanding form of epistemic responsibility.

It requires:

- **Willingness to be wrong:** You have to be genuinely open to evidence that contradicts your prior beliefs, including the ones you built your identity around.
- **Comfort with uncertainty:** Some questions don't resolve cleanly. The researcher who cannot hold an open question is not doing research — they are doing apologetics.
- **Engagement with counter-arguments:** The best case against a position must be understood before the position can be responsibly held.

- **Primary source contact:** You cannot make the truth your own by reading only about what others have concluded. You have to read the texts.
- **Experiential honesty:** If your spiritual experience contradicts your intellectual conclusions, that tension demands acknowledgment, not suppression of one side.
- **Courage to publish:** Research that stays private cannot be critiqued, corrected, or used by others. The act of publishing is itself a commitment to accountability.

SECTION 6

# For the Reader: What to Do With This

## 6.1 How to Use the Perennial Truth Library

The Library is not a doctrine. It is a body of research. The appropriate posture for engaging with it is the same posture the researcher brought to every source in its creation: read carefully, check the citations, notice what resonates and what doesn't, and form your own conclusions.

Specific guidance for different types of readers:

### Post-Institutional Seekers

If you have left a religious organization and are trying to understand what, if anything, was true in what you were taught — start with the biblical criticism volumes and the Gnostic texts. The framework that emerges is: more was true than the institution told you, but it was true in ways the institution never intended.

### Active Religious Believers

The research here does not tell you your tradition is wrong. It argues that the depth of your tradition is likely greater than what any single institution has disclosed. The mystical dimensions of Christianity, Islam, and Judaism are extensively documented and largely suppressed. Your tradition contains more than you have been shown.

### Skeptics and Non-Believers

The research here operates primarily at the textual and historical level — territory that does not require any prior spiritual commitment to evaluate. Whether or not you believe any of it is true, the historical and textual arguments stand on their own and can be assessed independently.

### Scholars and Critical Readers

Institutional criticism of independent research is expected and welcome. The standards documented in this manual are the standards against which this work should be held. Where the research falls short of those standards, that is a legitimate critique. Where the research meets them, the argument should be engaged on its merits.

## 6.2 An Invitation to Independent Inquiry

The ultimate argument of every document in the Perennial Truth Library, and of this methodology manual itself, is simple: you are allowed to look for yourself. You have always been allowed. The texts have always said so. The mystics of every tradition have confirmed it. The suppression of that fact is institutional, not scriptural.

The researcher who produced this body of work was raised to believe that independent spiritual investigation was dangerous — that it would lead only into deception and spiritual destruction. That warning, it turned out, was issued by people whose authority depended on the warning being believed.

The investigation did not lead to destruction. It led here: to a body of work, a methodology, a restored relationship with the texts, and an understanding of the divine that no organization gets to revoke.

> *"You were never as far from the truth as they told you you were."*

---

**Anthony Alvarez**

Independent Researcher, Alvarez Consulting

Theological & Esoteric Research Division

Perennial Truth Library

Los Angeles, California · 2026